

PENSACOLA PARTNERING TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

N00204.AR.001945

DATE: May 30 - 31,2001

NAS PENSACOLA

LOCATION: Memphis, TN

5090.3a

TEAM LEADER: Allison Harris

SCRIBE: Barbara Albrecht / Phil Hardy

GATE KEEPER/TIME KEEPER: Allison Harris

PROCESS FACILITATOR: None

ATTENDEES :

Team Members:

Allison Harris — EnSafe Inc.
Joe Fugitt — FDEP
Ron Joyner — NAS Pensacola
Brian Caldwell — EnSafe Inc.
Gena Townsend — USEPA
41 Support
Bill Hill — SouthDiv
Support

Support Members:

Lynn Wellman — USEPA
Paul Stoddard — Tier II Link
Lori Goetz — Site 38 Support
Phil Hardy — Site 41 Support
Barbara Albrecht — Site 2 /
Constantin Tudan — GIS

Greg Wilfley and Terry Hansen did not attend because of the ecological focus of the meeting.

1. Check-In

Meeting began at 8:00. Everyone is doing fine. The ground rules and meeting processes were reviewed. Tom Dillon was unable to attend due to schedule conflicts. Gena Townsend had his proxy.

2. Review of Action Items/Reminders

The following items were reviewed as priority topics for discussion during the May meeting:

(1)Tier II Update; (2)Site 41; (3)Site 2; (4)OU- 11 (Site 38);(5)OU- 13 (Sites 8 and 24);
(6)Tier II Deliverables; (7)Schedule Review; (8)Proposed Agenda for August 2001
Tier I Meeting

3. Tier II Update

The Team discussed the Joint Tier1 and 2 Meeting held on April 24 and 25, 2001

The Team thought that the Team presentations were scheduled back-to-back and not dispersed to allow adequate discussion between events. The team did not like the fact that the topic leader was inflexible and locked the door on late arrivals to the meeting.

4. Site 41 Review

Wetland 5A/B

The discussion of Wetland 5A/B revolved around the past history of the wetland and adjacent Site 30. Phil Hardy pointed out that the wetland begins at Outfall T, which is the outfall for the storm sewer system serving the BOQ area to the south of Taylor Road. Two other storm water outfalls drain storm water from the Building 648/649 complex into Wetland 5A, and a single outfall drains storm water from the Building 3220 area into Wetland 5B. It was noted that surface soil data from Site 30 presented to the Team by Phil Hardy showed potential concerns for Wetland 5A, especially from a cluster of soil borings located to the north of the wetland, between the wetland and the Building 648/649 complex. Surface soil results revealed metals and PAHs which may have contributed to elevated sediment HQs within Wetland 5A. Gena Townsend suggested that the Team move Wetland 5A/B out of the Site 41 RI and into the OU-2 RI. Bill Hill said that Site 30 may have contributed to the contamination found in Wetland 5A/B, however, a secondary source may still be contributing contamination to the wetland (storm water, for instance). It was mentioned that Wetland 5A is surrounded by a heavily vegetated buffer that could impede the transport of soils into the wetland. A question was raised as to whether the situation in the wetland has been stabilized and has the source been identified? Should the site be grouped with an IRP site since it is the end of a pathway, or should the site be addressed by itself, with the source, impact, and remedy addressed individually? It was noted that OU-2 does not have to be complete before a decision can be made for Site 41. Or, Site 41 could be put on hold until OU-2 is completed, and then amended as necessary. After discussing whether to transfer Wetland 5A/B to OU-2 (along with Wetlands 6 and 64) or put Site 41 on hold while OU-2 is addressed, the possibility of making interim RODs for wetlands close to completion was discussed. Gena and Joe stated they could support making interim RODs for wetlands recommended for no further action. This would leave open the possibility of addressing wetlands possibly needing further action (such as Wetland 5A/B) separately from wetlands that can be moved to a decision.

Further discussion was made concerning the high cadmium detection in Wetland 5B at sample location 041M5B02 (HQ of 323.53). It was suggested that the distribution of cadmium be looked at and refined for all wetlands that are storm water drainage systems. Which organisms might be used to measure cadmium toxicity in sediment were discussed (*Hyallorella*, sp.; Chironomids). It was asked whether the drainage ditches on base are ever cleaned out. Phil Hardy said he has seen the base landscaping contractors chopping the vegetation out of Wetland 6 and spraying herbicides to control weeds growing along its banks. Ron Joyner

confirmed that Wetlands 5B and 6 are periodically maintained, but that it had not been done in a number of years. Ron did say that Rodeo[®] aquatic herbicide was apparently used in Wetlands 5B and 6 in 1993.

Wetland 6

Wetland 6 is an open drainage ditch that conveys storm water from the developed eastern portion of the base to Wetland 64. Phil Hardy stated how he had examined base storm water maps for this area. Wetland 6 begins as Outfalls R and S, which collectively drain storm water from roughly 17,000 linear-feet of storm sewer mains that are connected to approximately 80 catchment basins. Allison Harris described Wetland 6 as the surface expression for the storm water system serving the Officer housing area and the Chapel/PSD area. The reason Wetland 6 is an open ditch is because it is tidally influenced all the way to the discharging outfalls. It was noted that 4,4'-DDE/DDT were detected above their respective basewide levels at sample location 04 1M0060 1. This sample was collected near the discharge point for Outfall R. Discussion was made that this sample is located in an area near the Chapel and parade grounds, where heavy landscaping maintenance occurs. The DDD/DDT detections likely resulted from application. Ron Joyner stated that no DDT mixing or resultant spillage would have occurred in this area.

Wetland 48

Wetland 48 had only one sediment sample collected from it (041M4801), with 4,4'-DDD/DDE/DDT concentrations above basewide levels. Phil Hardy related that this sample was collected from adjacent the road that divides Wetlands 48 and 52, where the small stream flowing through Wetland 48 crosses beneath this road through a culvert. The high DDD/DDE/DDT in this sample very likely resulted from past application practices. Ron Joyner added that Wetland 48 is located in a remote area of the base, and that DDT mixing and possible spillage would not have occurred in this area. The group noted that DDD/DDE/DDT was not detected above basewide levels in Wetland 52, which is downgradient from Wetland 48. Wetland 56, which is downgradient from Wetland 52 had 4,4'-DDD slightly above the basewide level, but since this sample was collected adjacent to Radford Blvd., the detection is likely related to application. Gena said to add discussion to the refinement section of the RI concerning the remote location of Wetland 48, the downstream comparisons, and that TOC for location 041M480 1 should also be examined.

Wetland 52

Gena Townsend said Wetland 52 has PAHs ("...enes") at sampling point 041M52E3 that are not related to discharges at UST-18. A review of the RI revealed seven PAHs with HQs above one at this location. Phil Hardy related that sample point 041M52E3 was positioned in a surface water drainage feature leading south from the transient aircraft parking area at Forest Sherman Field. The constituents found at 041M52E3 could be related to maintenance, servicing, and operation of aircraft from the transient aircraft area. Gena related that

Wetland 52 cannot be added to the UST program. The Team would like to look at the mean ERM Quotients for total PAHs in the refinement of discussions for Wetland 52. We should discuss the location of 041M52E3 and the mean ERM Quotients. Under CERCLA, a PAH exclusion may be viable because of the aircraft/ground support operations at the transient aircraft area. This argument has been successfully used in the past at other bases. Adjacent flight-line and aircraft operations activities should be addressed in the refinement of the discussion for Wetland 52.

Wetland 58

Wetland 58 is a vegetated interdunal swale located on the Intercoastal Waterway between the Oakgrove Campground and Lighthouse Point. Gena Townsend was concerned because the single sediment sample collected from this wetland had *six* PAH detections with HQs above one. Gena was worried about the potential source for these exceedances. The Team decided to run a mean ERM Quotient and Total PAH Comparison for Wetland 58 and the refinement of the discussion for this wetland should show that the wetland is not a migration pathway to Pensacola Bay.

Wetland 64

Phil Hardy presented a 1939 map of the Naval base that shows the original configuration of the Yacht Basin area. He presented an overlay that depicts the amount of filling that later took place in this water body, showing how most of Site 11 was once a submerged area. Phil also presented data comparing adjacent Site 11 trench and soil samples to Wetland 64 sediment data. Allison Harris said we need to see if trench data represents surface or subsurface soil samples. Gena Townsend noted that there was a probable connection between the soil detections at Site 11 and the sediment contamination in the southern portion of Wetland 64.

Barbara Albrecht presented photos showing how there are several dozen wood-pilings attached to docks in the northern part of the Yacht Basin. The pilings, along with the dozens of boats moored in the Yacht Basin are the likely sources for the contamination found in the northern part of Wetland 64. Brian Caldwell and Ron Joyner recalled that several years ago they had to place booms across the downstream end of Wetland 6 because of a leaking fuel UST upstream. Ron also reported that the Yacht Basin does not have fueling operations for boats. There is a 500-gallon AST for gasoline west of the marina that is used for car and truck fueling.

Wetland 72

Wetland 72 is a wet weather conveyance that receives storm water runoff from the northwest side of Forest Sherman Field and from the northern end of Wetland W1. Wetland 72 drains into Wetland 39, which drains into Bayou Grande. Gena Townsend was concerned about the silver detected in surface water at sample location 041W7201, which had a HQ of 62.85. The discussion for Wetland 72 included what the source of the silver might be, or whether it was an isolated detection. Surface water sample data from AZ- 1 of nearby Bayou Grande revealed

no silver detections, indicating negligible contaminant migration for silver from Wetland 72 surface water. Since there is no apparent source or migration, this wetland should go into refinement (ie., isolated detection with no apparent source).

Wetland W1

Wetland W1 is affected by nearby UST-18 (formerly, IRP Site 3). The wetland is a drainage pathway for the southwestern side of the north-south runway at Forest Sherman Field. Approximately 13 storm water catchment basins collect surface runoff from the UST-18 and adjacent areas. Storm water mains transport this runoff to the north, discharging to Wetland 72, and also to the south, discharging to Wetland 52. Under the UST program, land farming is being conducted to help further natural attenuation at UST-18. Wetland W1 is saturated to the surface in several places, and supports a variety of wetland plants.

Standing water occurs in a few places near the northern end of this wetland. The main burn-pits in UST 18 were located in the northern end of UST-18, about 800 feet from the wetland. Gena Townsend does not support NFA for Wetland W1 because of elevated lead in surface water at sample locations 041WW101 and 041WW102. Adjacent wells also exhibited lead above appropriate groundwater standards. The discussion for Wetland W1 included whether airfield activities might have contributed to the elevated lead in the wetland. According to Brian Caldwell, lead might also be leaching to surface water due to the naturally occurring acidic conditions of the surface water from the breakdown of organic matter. The UST program is addressing the lead at the site. The refinement of the discussion for this wetland should review and compare UST-18 soil and groundwater data to the Wetland W1 sediment and surface water data. The refinement discussion should also address the issue of Wetland W1 being a storm water drainage pathway and should include discussion of UST-18.

Upcoming Mercury Tissue Analyses

Barbara Albrecht and Allison Harris discussed the upcoming fish tissue sampling scheduled for the Site 40 and asked what mercury sampling should be conducted for the wetlands. Wetland 64 and 18 were the only wetlands with the protection of fish viability endpoint. Wetland 18 had no detections of mercury, but Wetland 64 did. The Team agreed that Wetland 64 would be included in the Site 40 sampling event. EnSafe will evaluate the mercury and TOC data and propose sampling locations for concurrence. Samples will be whole prey fish collected for mercury tissue analyses. Surface water and sediment samples will also be collected. This sampling should be conducted by July of 2001. There was discussion about whether any freshwater wetlands have surface water mercury exceedances. The Team agreed to sample Wetland 64 for mercury.

5. Site-2 Review

Barbara Albrecht discussed the mean ERM Quotients calculated for the site. Despite the data presentations, the Team was unable to reach a decision on action. EnSafe will prepare the RI Addendum for submittal. Site 2 will be scheduled for the August meeting as a topic.

① OU-11 (Site 38) Review

Gena Townsend said MNA studies have revealed a decrease in constituent levels in both the Building 604 Area (chlorinated solvents) and the Building 71 Area (lead) because of ongoing MNA. Well 38GS19, near building 604, has not responded adequately to MNA, but surrounding downgradient wells are clean. Gena suggested an aggressive quarterly monitoring program at Site 38, looking for an expanded suite of contaminants for a one-year period included in the remedial design. The purpose for this is to show how MNA may be improving site groundwater over time, and to see if remedial goals may be met. Gena is still supportive of the MNA alternative, and said EPA is satisfied with the approach.

Bill Hill suggested that the remedial design for Site 38 may call for incorporating an enhancement to 38GS19 to make it more conducive to MNA. Gena suggested it may be more appropriate to place institutional controls on the area, since the downgradient wells seem to be very conducive to MNA. If an enhancement is needed, that could be considered as another alternative (anaerobic/aerobic) and not MNA.

Joe Fugitt reviewed some minor comments he had on the Site 38 RI Addendum, and said these would be formally presented in an FDEP comment letter. Joe suggested that groundwater data may not indicate a leachability issue for Site 38, but that this may need to be confirmed for cadmium in the vicinity of 38GS19. Allison Harris agreed, but Lori Goetz said it may be a water geochemistry issue instead of a leachability issue. Joe also wondered if an attenuation mechanism was in place for vinyl chloride at Building 604. Joe later retracted his recommendation for SPLP sampling near 38GS19, saying it may not be warranted after all because soil data show exceedances of the leachability criteria. Joe was also concerned about what may be happening between the most upgradient well, 38GS28, and the most downgradient wells; specifically, 38GS08 and 38GS32. Joe suggested, and Allison agreed, that a new well downgradient from Building 604 may be appropriate for any monitoring program established for the Building 604 Area.

7. OU-13 (Sites 8 and 24) Review

The Team reassessed the OU 13 soil volumes and agreed that the FDEP leachability criteria were appropriate for cadmium and dieldrin in subsurface soil.

Brian will reevaluate the soil volumes based that criteria and submit an addendum to the FS.

8. Tier 1/Tier II Deliverables

The Team agreed that there were no current activities that would warrant a success story.

9. Schedule Reviews

OU-2

Comments on the draft FS are due by June 13, 2001. EPA has not reviewed this document yet. We have final acceptance of the RI Report, and have comments from FDEP on the draft FS. Comments are needed from EPA. The schedule will likely slip by a quarter from the 4th Quarter, 2003 target for the ROD.

OU-11 (Site 38)

Bill Hill said that the RI Addendum for OU-11/Site 38 was submitted on March, 16, 2001 and was in the review process. The final FS is scheduled for completion on December 8, 2001, with the Proposed Plan completed by September 2002. The decision document should be signed by May 27, 2003. Bill still feels that OU-11/Site 38 is on schedule.

OU-13 (Sites 8 and 24)

Bill Hill said the draft FS Addendum for OU-13/Sites 8 and 24 was submitted on March 22, 2001; two-months behind what was originally scheduled. The FS was to be completed by July 2, 2001, but might slip at least one-month. The proposed plan for OU-13 is scheduled for completion on April 23, 2002. Allison says the draft is already finished, so the schedule might possibly be shortened. The decision document for OU-13 should be ready by December 2002. Gena said the ROD date for OU-13 (4th Quarter 2001) is a hard date in EPA's database, which Bill said would be missed. Gena said the ROD for OU-13 could be pushed out to a later date, and she will see if the 3rd Quarter, 2002 is feasible.

Site 2

The final ROD is due in November of 2003 (1st Quarter of FY-2003)

Site 15

The Site 15 Remedial Design was completed on January 15, 2001. The Remedial Action is due to start during the 3rd Quarter of 2001. Gena Townsend needs notification from Bill Hill when the equipment will be on-site. A mobilization date needs to be announced.

Site 40

Bill Hill discussed the plan to collect additional fish samples, which was supposed to be done by May 8, 2001 but was delayed so Site 41 could be included in the same mobilization. The event likely will be deferred to July of 2001. The RI Addendum is due in July of 2001, but will slip by approximately two-months. Though the Site 40 reports are running a little behind schedule, Bill wants to

leave the schedule intact to see if the time that was lost can be made up. The FS is to be completed by June of 2002, with a Proposed Plan due during May of 2003, and a ROD in January of 2004.

Site 41

The ROD was scheduled for 3rd Quarter, 2003. This may change if an interim ROD is published for selected Site 41 wetlands.

10. Proposed Agenda for August 2001 Tier I Meeting

Table 1 contains a proposed agenda for the August 2001 meeting, which will be held on August 28 and 29, 2001 at EnSafe’s Pensacola, FL branch office. The meeting leader will be Bill Hill. Allison Harris will not attend. Phil Hardy and Barbara Albrecht will be present to take notes and otherwise assist. A NAS Pensacola RAB meeting will also be held during this period.

Next Meeting Agenda:

Description	Presenter	Time	Category/ Expectation
<i>August 2001</i>			
OU-13	Brian	1 hour	Finalize OU-13 FS
Site 2	Barbara / Phil	1 hour	Resolution
Site 41	Barbara / Phil	4 hours	Finish Comment Review
Fish Mercury Sampling	Barbara / Phil	1 hour	Date Review
Pre/Post RAB	Ron	1 hour	Review
Tier II Update	Paul	0.5 hour	Information Update
Lunch	Team	2 hours	Refresh
Breaks	Team	40 min	Relax
Facilitator Training	All	1 hour	Learn
Check In/Check Out	Bill	2 hours	Hello/Good bye

Parking; Lot

Item No.	Parking Lot Issue
9903-A13	Bill will submit a letter to CPA and State requesting that OU-10 be handled under RCRA authority
9802-A14	Brian to follow up on the list of wells to be kept for future modeling
9806-A44	Review 'tier II deliverable packages (rev. 9) for corrections and respond to Bill.
9811-M03	Bring MBTI materials to all meetings.
0003-A12	Terry will be copied on all correspondence henceforth for the AR.

Open Action Items

Action Item #	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action item
0009-A50	Joe	Complete		Joe will submit concurrence (pending 0009-A49).
0012-A1	Joe	Complete		Site 102: New wells have Al and Fe above secondary standard. Joe to get Tim Bahr's spin on issue.
0012-A2	ferry	Complete		Site 102: Terry to look at Site 102 Al and Fe in comparison to regional ambient data, and the FDEP calculated health-based RGOs.
0012-A3	Ron	Complete		Site 43: Ron to take care of excavated drums and overpacks from Site 43. Pending criteria at 43 and TTNUST time frame June / July 01 Terry and Greg will coordinate with Ron and work it out Ron will coordinate with Hill.
0012-A4	Allison	Complete		Site 12: Allison to check and see if any soil exceeded leachability values on the western side of Site 12 (contractor wants to pave). Ron has results
0012-A5	Gena	Complete		Schedules: Gena to clarify "start" dates for RA. Will also submit any review comments to Bill on schedules.
0012-A6	Allison	Complete		Site 2: Allison to use ERM quotients to factor chemical data from Site 2 into the triad system. On May agenda
0012-A7	Joe	Complete		Site 38: Joe to discuss discrepancies and applicability between 62-302 and 62-770 for some parameters (F) with Tim Bar. FAC 62 302 is if substances are toxic then surface water is to be free from these needs to talk with leigha COMPLETE values for surface water on some parameters in 777 are based on toxicity and would supercede 302 (free from paragraph) this may be unresolvable
0012-A8	Joe	Complete		Site 41: Joe to synthesize his comments and discuss with Jim, Eric, and Tim. comments mailed out
0012-A9	Gena	Complete		Site 41: Gena to get Lynn's feedback on her comments. comments stand as submitted
0012-A10	Joe and Tom	Complete		Site 41: Joe and Tom to have their comments by next meeting. Joe sent in draft tom e-mailed his
0012-A11	Team	Complete		Joint meeting presentation: Ron, Bill, Brian, Joe, and Gena to prepare slide text for joint meeting presentation on Site 2
	Ron	Complete		Kon Joyner to find out what fueling facilities exist at the sailing marina. <i>They have an above ground fuel tank for cars and trucks, no facilities for the boats; 500 gal AST for gasoline west of marina Sherman Cove has boat fuel facilities</i>
0103-A2	Allison	Complete		Allison will see if there is any low-flow data for Site 11 Some low-flow data exist for Site 11 (6 wells from 1995 OU-2 resampling)
0103-A3	Joe			Joe Fugitt to find out if the UST Site behind 3450 is still active.
0103-A4	Kon	Complete		Kon Joyner to get rainfall data from January 1996 to August 1997. Ron has forwarded the rainfall data to the Team
0104-A1	Team	Complete		REVIEW TEAM DELIVERABLES AND COMMENT TO BILL prior to may meeting On May Agenda One change noted.
0105-A1	Barbara	Pending		Calculate ERM quotients for individual Site 41 Wetlands
0105-A2	Allison	Pending		Find out which wetlands can be separated from the Site 41 RI and moved into an interim-ROD.
0105-A3	Barbara	Pending		Pull Site 2 data together in a preliminary RI report addendum.
0105-A4	Bill	Pending		Develop proposed schedule for Site 41 IROD.
0105-A5	Lynn	Pending		Check with Bobby Lewis concerning the Site 2 samples to see if there is a sample which could be used for TOC determination.